Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 3 Part 6

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

Round III

> Why do you think that the books collected centuries after Muhammad are more reliable sources regarding the words and deeds of Muhammad? Why rejecting those books should undermine the HISTORIC value of the Quran? I find no connection. Let's say I reject the claims of a biography of Jefferson written by a contemporary author and you tell me: "Well, if you reject this book then how can you prove that Jefferson was indeed a real person who drafted the constitution of the United States ?"

Jefferson's proof of existence does not depend on one biography. The evidence of his existence is overwhelming. But if you deny all of them then you can't proof even the existence of Jefferson .

If you deny every biography of Muhammad then his very existence becomes questionable.

> I am not sure how serious you are in your denying the historic reality of Muhammad. You are right that I cannot PROVE his existence to you, neither you can prove to me that there was Jesus or Socrates. But, you are missing the entire point.

We know about Socrates because Plato wrote about him. So far no own is questioning what Plato said nor is calling him a liar. But if people start doubting Plato call him a liar who fabricated stories and passed them as truth (basically what you say about the biographers of Muhammad) then we cannot be sure that Socrates existed. All we know about Socrates is through Plato and if he is found to be a liar then his story about Socrates could also be a lie.

The existence of Jesus has come under question precisely because there is so little information about him outside the Christian literature. Nonetheless, what you are asking is even graver. You want us to disregard any story about Muhammad even though they are written by his followers. If these books were written by the enemies of Muhammad, you had a point. Enemies are often biased and their reporting may not be accurate. But demanding to discard the stories written by the followers of Muhammad is absurd. Under what basis? .. Just because they portray Muhammad as a criminal? Would you have made such outlandish demand if the hadiths portrayed Muhammad as a saint? That is not acceptable at all.

Because these stories are told by the Muslims themselves they are like confessions. You do not throw out the confessions. We know that Muslims lie. Those who reported these stories tried to depict their prophet as a holy man and attributed miracles to him. We do not have to accept all those lies. They make no sense and they are against the Quran as well as logic. But there is no reason to reject the confessions of the Muslims.

> I follow the Quran and whether Muhammad existed or not is really a side issue in the context of the message of the Quran. I am not following Muhammad; I am following the message of the messenger. I am here to defend the principals and teachings of the Quran. Did Muhammad really exist or not, was Muhammad a good guy or not, is not relevant right now.

That is absurd. The message of Islam depends on the credibility of its messenger. If Muhammad was a mere mailman who had brought a book written and sealed by god in an envelope. Then his credibility would have been irrelevant. When you receive a letter from your friend by mail, you do not interrogate the mailman.

But if someone brings to you a verbal message with no credentials whatsoever, then his credibility is of extreme importance. What if he is lying? What if he has made up the whole thing to fool you and make you do what he wants, especially if there is a clear gain in that message for him? What if he demands you to pay part of your wealth to him, wage war for him, kill your fellow human being and be ready to die for him? What if he starts killing, raping, looting and assassinating people with your help? If a man does such despicable things can't he also lie? You hear him also lie. You hear him say "war is a game of deception" and on several occasions he instructs his followers to lie in order to deceive his opponents. Couldn't such man have lied about his alleged message too? Muhammad gained a lot with his claim. From being an indigent he rose to become the absolute potentate of the land. How can you believe in such man blindly and not question his credentials and motives?

If he was a liar and a criminal as his biography show couldn't he have lied about his message too?

How can Muhammad's character be irrelevant? Why would God choose a man with such low moral fiber like him to be his mouthpiece? Isn't it absurd that God send a criminal to teach mankind goodness and virtues? How can Muhammad's character be irrelevant when he claimed to have "*sublime morals*" (68:4) be "*a good example to follow*" (33:21) and refer to himself as "*the mercy of God for all the worlds*"? (21:107) Are these lies? If they are, how can you be sure that the rest of his Quran are not lies?

Muhammad called himself *Khayru-l-Khalq*, "Best of Creation" and claimed to be exalted above others prophets in degrees (2:253); to be the preferred one (17:55); to have been risen "to a praised estate" (17:79) a station which he said none but he would receive and this is "the Station of Intercession at the right of the Glorious Throne". In other words he would

be the person whom God will consult in the Day of Judgment to decide who should go to Hell and who should be admitted to Paradise .

The following two verses express vividly his sense of self importance and grandiosity.

Truly, Allah and His angels send praise and blessings [forever] upon the Prophet. O ye who believe! Praise and bless the Prophet with utmost laud and blessing" (33:56).

In order that ye (O men) may believe in Allah and His Messenger, that ye may assist and honour Him, and celebrate His praise morning and evening. (48:9).

Muhammad was so impressed of himself that made his god say: "*And thou (standest) on an exalted standard of character*" (68:4) and areth "_a lamp with spreading ligh_t" (33:46)

In a Hadith Qudsi he makes his Allah say to him: **"Were it not for you, I would not have created the universe."** Imagine the level of insanity!

Let us delve into the sick mind of this psychopath narcissist and see what else he said about himself:

- "The very first thing that Allah Almighty ever created was my soul."
- "First of all things, the Lord created my mind."
- "I am from Allah, and the believers are from me." source

And you tell me that it really does not matter whether he was a good guy or not? So all these self adulating verses are hot air? How could a man who spoke so approvingly of himself live so contemptibly?

Zhuang zi said "*The wise man teaches not by words but by actions.*" And you tell me the actions of Muhammad are irrelevant and what counts are his words? That even though he lived like a criminal he can teach us to live like saints? Look at the sainthood of the Islamic world. Those who follow him most are hate mongers and terrorists. If you are a good person it's because you deny the hadidth, reinterpret the Quran and twist its meanings and refuse to live the way Muhammad lived or follow his examples. But are you truly a Muslim?

How can darkness brighten the world? How can ignorance impart knowledge? How can vice produce virtue? How can hate promote love? How can Jihad bring peace?

"The superior man acts before he speaks, and afterwards speaks according to his actions", said Confucius. Is that how Muhammad lived?

I again invite you to tell me which verses of the Quran you have problems with and why. Please be specific and concise as possible. Let's discuss the real issues. I hope we will not be distracted by secondary issues.

Let us start with the above verses. Show me Muhammad had sublime morals, was a good example to follow and was a mercy of God for all the worlds.

PS: I believe and argue that the Quran is word of God and the information contain there is authentic. Inshallah, when we get over this procedural issues I will share you my REASONS why I believe in the divine nature of the Quran.

Peace,